

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

I. STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 19-64 remain in this application. Claims 1-18 and 65-130 were previously canceled. Claims 19, 30, 41, and 53 have been amended to clarify the invention.

II. CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Office Action rejected Claims 19-28 and 30-39 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Logan et al. (Re. 36, 801) in view of Ito et al ('894 B2).

Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claims 19 and 30 have been amended to clarify the invention and appear as follows:

19. A process for simultaneous storage and playback of multimedia data in a computer environment, comprising the steps of:  
providing a plurality of input signal tuners in a device;  
wherein said tuners accept analog and digital television broadcast signals;  
wherein each of said tuners is individually tuned to a specific broadcast signal;  
converting analog television broadcast signals into a digital signal;  
storing said digital signals and digital television broadcast signals on a storage device in the device;  
providing a plurality of output devices in the device;  
wherein each of said output devices extracts a specific digital signal from said storage device;

decoding said specific digital signals into a television output signal;  
sending said television output signal to a television monitor; and  
wherein said plurality of output devices allows for a picture in a picture display on said television monitor.

30. An apparatus for simultaneous storage and playback of multimedia data in a computer environment, comprising:
- a plurality of input signal tuners in a device;
  - wherein said tuners accept analog and digital television broadcast signals;
  - wherein each of said tuners is individually tuned to a specific broadcast signal;
  - a module for converting analog television broadcast signals into a digital signal;
  - a module for storing said digital signals and digital television broadcast signals on a storage device in the device;
  - a plurality of output devices in the device;
  - wherein each of said output devices extracts a specific digital signal from said storage device;
  - a module for decoding said specific digital signals into a television output signal;
  - a module for sending said television output signal to a television monitor;
  - and
  - wherein said plurality of output devices allows for a picture in a picture display on said television monitor.

As discussed with the Examiner during a 3 July 2003 interview and, as pointed out in the Office Action, Logan does not specifically disclose a plurality of output devices. Ito teaches external editing apparatuses for editing video data stored in a server system. This is not what is claimed in Claims 19 and 30.

Ito does not teach or disclose a system that provides a plurality of output devices in the device as claimed in Claims 19 and 30. Ito teaches away from such a system by teaching that Ito's editing apparatuses are external to the server. Therefore, Ito does not contemplate providing a plurality of output devices in the device as claimed in Claims 19 and 30.

The Office Action's conclusion that incorporating Ito's editing apparatus into Logan's system would result in the claimed invention is improbable because combining Ito and Logan would result in Logan's system having external editing apparatuses with Logan's system acting as a video data server which is not what is claimed in Claims 19 and 30.

Therefore, Logan et al. in view of Ito et al. do not teach or disclose the invention as claimed.

Claims 19 and 30 are in allowable condition. Claims 20-28 and 31-39 are dependent upon independent Claims 19 and 30, respectively. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

### III. CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Office Action rejected Claims 29 and 40 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Logan et al. (Re. 36, 801) in view of Ito et al ('894 B2) as applied to claims 19 and 30, above, and further in view of Yuen et al. ('409).

The rejection under 35 USC §103(a) is deemed moot in view of Applicant's comments regarding Claims 19 and 30, above. Claims 29 and 40 are dependent upon Independent Claims 19 and 30, respectively. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection under 35 USC §103(a).

IV. CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Office Action rejected Claims 41-50, 52-62 and 64 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Logan et al. (Re. 36, 801) in view of Ito et al ('894 B2) and further in view of Hirayama et al. ('356).

Claims 41 and 53 are allowable in the same manner as Claims 19 and 30, above.

Claims 42-50, 52 and 54-62, 64 are dependent upon independent Claims 41 and 53, respectively. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

V. CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Office Action rejected Claims 51 and 63 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Logan et al. (Re. 36, 801) in view of Ito et al ('894 B2) and Hirayama et al. ('356) as applied to claims 41 and 53 above, and further in view of Yuen et al. ('409).

The rejection under 35 USC §103(a) is deemed moot in view of Applicant's comments regarding Claims 41 and 53, above. Claims 51 and 63 are dependent upon Independent Claims 41 and 53, respectively. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection under 35 USC §103(a).

VI. MISCELLANEOUS

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

The Applicants believe that all issues raised in the Office Action have been addressed and that allowance of the pending claims is appropriate. Entry of the amendments herein and further examination on the merits are respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (408) 414-1080 to discuss any issue that may advance prosecution.

No fee is believed to be due specifically in connection with this Reply. To the extent necessary, Applicants petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fee that may be due in connection with this Reply to our Deposit Account No. 50-1302.

Respectfully submitted,

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER LLP

Dated: February 17, 2004


  
Kirk D. Wong  
Reg. No. 43,284

1600 Willow Street  
San Jose, California 95125-5106  
Telephone No.: (408) 414-1080 ext. 214  
Facsimile No.: (408) 414-1076

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Non-Fee Amend, Commissioner for Patents, P. O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

on February 17, 2004  
(Date)

by   
(Signature)